

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/537,155	LEE ET AL.	

All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Allowable</u>
(1) <u>Patrick F. O'Reilly III.</u>	(3) _____.
(2) <u>David A. Bilodeau, Attorney for Applicant.</u>	(4) _____.
Date of Interview: <u>24 November 2008</u>	Time: <u>12:30 pm</u>
Type of Interview:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, provide a brief description: .	
Part I.	
Rejection(s) discussed:	
N/A	
Claims discussed:	
<i>Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, and 22 - minor substantive changes and grammatical informalities.</i>	
Prior art documents discussed:	
N/A	
Part II.	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:	
See <i>Continuation Sheet</i>	
Part III.	
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	
<i>/Steven B. McAllister/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3749 /Patrick F. O'Reilly III/ Examiner, Art Unit 3749</i>	
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner and the applicant's attorney discussed the incorporation of the claim 2 limitations into independent claim 1 so as to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. In addition, the examiner discussed minor grammatical informalities in claims 1, 6, 12, and 22 with the applicant's attorney. The applicant's attorney agreed to all of the changes proposed by the examiner to place the claims in a condition for allowance. The specific changes are documented in the attached Examiner's Amendment.